UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,025	06/20/2003	Jeffery A. Engelman	BLD920030006US1	7144

50441 7590 10/26/2007

DUFT BORNSEN & FISHMAN, LLP
1526 SPRUCE STREET
SUITE 302
BOULDER, CO 80302

EXAMINER	
SINGH, SATWANT K	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,025	ENGELMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant K. Singh	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 11 July 2007.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parry (US 6,972,863).

5. Regarding Claim 1, Parry discloses a printer for printing an encoded data stream, the data stream capable of including a section of complex text data, the printer comprising: a text parser adapted to parse the encoded data stream to determine the section of complex text data in the encoded data stream (printer processor detects at least one or more barcodes in the data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8); and a layout engine coupled to the text parser, the layout engine adapted to receive the section of complex text data from the text parser and adapted to determine at least one of a

plurality of glyphs of at least one font (barcodes) corresponding to the section of complex text data (no URL is embedded in the barcode and the barcode is printed as regular data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

6. Regarding Claim 2, Parry discloses a printer further comprising: a rasterizer, coupled with the layout engine, the text parser and the at least one font, the rasterizer adapted to position the at least one of the plurality of glyphs on at least one portion of a page corresponding to the section of complex text data (the processor and the memory perform rendering functions) (col. 3, lines 15-26).

7. Regarding Claim 9. Parry discloses a printer wherein the text parser determines the section of complex text data based upon at least one marker for the section of complex text data (detecting barcodes) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

8. Regarding Claim 10, Parry discloses a printer for printing an encoded data stream, the data stream capable of including a section of complex text data, the printer comprising: means for parsing data for determining the section of complex text data in the data stream (printer processor detects at least one or more barcodes in the data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8); and at least one font including a plurality of glyphs (barcodes), layout means, coupled to the parsing means and with the at least one font defining means, the layout means for receiving the section of complex text data from the text parser and for determining at least one of the plurality of glyphs corresponding to the section of complex text data (no URL is embedded in the barcode and the barcode is printed as regular data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

9. Regarding Claim 11, Parry discloses a method for printing an encoded data stream, the data stream capable of including a section of complex text data, the method comprising the steps of: (a) parsing the data stream in a printer to determine the section of complex text data in the data stream (printer processor detects at least one or more barcodes in the data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8); and (b) utilizing a layout engine to receive the section of complex text data from the text parser and to determine at least one of the plurality of glyphs corresponding to the section of complex text data (no URL is embedded in the barcode and the barcode is printed as regular data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

10. Regarding Claim 12, Parry discloses a method further comprising the step of: (c) positioning the at least one of the plurality of glyphs on at least one portion of a page corresponding to the section of complex text data (no URL is embedded in the barcode and the barcode is printed as regular data) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

11. Regarding Claim 18, Parry discloses a method wherein the data parsing step (a) further includes the step of: (a1) determining the section of complex text data based upon at least one marker for the section of complex text data (detecting barcodes) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 3, 5-8, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry in view of Nguyen et al. (US 7,079,264).

14. Regarding Claim 3, Parry fails to teach a printer wherein the at least one font includes an encoding table and a glyph table, the encoding table including a plurality of codes and a plurality of glyph indices corresponding to the plurality of codes, the glyph table including the plurality of glyphs corresponding to the plurality of glyph indices.

Nguyen et al teaches wherein the at least one font includes an encoding table (glyph translations table's map table) and a glyph table (glyph translation table), the encoding table including a plurality of codes and a plurality of glyph indices corresponding to the plurality of codes (glyph translation table's map table to determine the particular symbol set), the glyph table including the plurality of glyphs corresponding to the plurality of glyph indices (particular set in which the desired glyph is supported) (col. 9, lines 10-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry with the teaching of Nguyen to store the encoding table and glyph table on the printer and use these to determine the barcode to be printed.

15. Regarding Claim 5, Parry fails to teach a printer wherein the layout engine determines the at least one glyph by determining at least one index of the plurality of glyph indices for the section of complex text data and at least one position for the at least one glyph.

Nguyen teaches wherein the layout engine determines the at least one glyph by determining at least one index of the plurality of glyph indices for the section of complex text data (Fig. 4, S143) and at least one position for the at least one glyph (Fig. 4, S145) (col. 9, lines 10-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry with the teaching of Nguyen to store the encoding table and glyph table on the printer and use these to determine the barcode to be printed.

16. Regarding Claim 6, Parry teaches a printer wherein the text parser provides a remaining portion of the data stream not including the section of complex text data to the rasterizer to perform one-to-one rendering of a remaining portion of the data stream (the processor and the memory perform rendering functions) (col. 3, lines 15-26).

17. Regarding Claim7, Parry fails to teach a printer wherein the code is Unicode and wherein the section of complex text data includes Unicode complex text.

Nguyen teaches wherein the code is Unicode and wherein the section of complex text data includes Unicode complex text (Unicode standard support) (col. 4, lines 9-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry with the teaching of Nguyen to embed the barcode data using Unicode complex text.

18. Regarding Claim 8, Parry teaches a printer wherein the text parser determines the section of complex text data based upon at least one code word for the section of complex text data (detecting barcodes) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

19. Regarding Claim 13, Parry fails to teach a method further comprising the step of: (c) utilizing an encoding table including a plurality of codes and a plurality of glyph indices corresponding to the plurality of codes, the glyph table including the plurality of glyphs corresponding to the plurality of glyph indices.

Nguyen teaches a method further comprising the step of: (c) utilizing an encoding table (glyph translations table's map table) including a plurality of codes and a plurality of glyph indices corresponding to the plurality of codes (glyph translation table's map table to determine the particular symbol set), the glyph table (glyph translation table) including the plurality of glyphs corresponding to the plurality of glyph indices (particular set in which the desired glyph is supported) (col. 9, lines 10-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry with the teaching of Nguyen to store the encoding table and glyph table on the printer and use these to determine the barcode to be printed.

20. Regarding Claim 14, Parry fails to teach a method wherein the layout engine determines the at least one glyph by determining at least one index of the plurality of glyph indices for the section of complex text data and at least one position for the at least one glyph.

Nguyen teaches a method wherein the layout engine determines the at least one glyph by determining at least one index of the plurality of glyph indices for the section of complex text data (Fig. 4, S143) and at least one position for the at least one glyph (Fig. 4, S145) (col. 9, lines 10-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry with the teaching of Nguyen to store the encoding table and glyph table on the printer and use these to determine the barcode to be printed.

21. Regarding Claim 15, Parry teaches a method further comprising the step of: (d) utilizing a rasterizer to perform one-to-one rendering of a remaining portion of the encoded data stream not including the section of complex text data (the processor and the memory perform rendering functions) (col. 3, lines 15-26).

22. Regarding Claim 16, Parry fails to teach a method wherein the code is Unicode and wherein the section of complex text data includes Unicode complex text.

Nguyen teaches a method wherein the code is Unicode and wherein the section of complex text data includes Unicode complex text (Unicode standard support) (col. 4, lines 9-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry with the teaching of Nguyen to embed the barcode data using Unicode complex text.

23. Regarding Claim 17, Parry teaches a method, wherein the data parsing step (a) further includes the step of: (a1) determining the section of complex text data based

upon at least one code word for the section of complex text data (detecting barcodes) (col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 8).

24. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry and Nguyen et al. as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of McConnell et al. (US 5,526,477).

25. Regarding Claim 4, Parry and Nguyen et al fail to teach a printer wherein at least one glyph can include a null glyph.

McConnell et al teach a printer wherein at least one glyph can include a null glyph (defaults representing null characters) (col. 22, lines 8-16).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Parry and Nguyen with the teaching of McConnell to use a null glyph for the purpose of combining characters.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ackley (US 6,024,289) discloses a method and apparatus for encoding and decoding single byte characters in double byte character set of machine readable symbologies such as barcode symbologies.

Peng et al. (US 6,252,671) discloses transmitting a font available on a computer to an output device supporting a page description language with a download format.

Murray (US 7,061,630) discloses a document processing system that renders digital image data in individual pages, where each individual page is rendered to a bitmap page and a corresponding control string.

Bloomberg et al. (US RE38,758) discloses providing a self-clocking glyph shape codes for encoding digital data in the shapes of glyphs that are suitable for printing on hardcopy recording media.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

sks

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER